



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Region 6

**1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75202-2733**

November 17, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: OEP/DG2E/Gas 2; Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC and Cheniere Corpus Christi Pipeline, LP; Docket Nos. CP12-507-000 & CP12-508-000

In accordance with our responsibilities under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 6 office in Dallas, Texas, has completed its review of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Corpus Christi Liquefied Natural Gas Project (CCLNG or Project).

EPA's review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) identified a number of potential adverse impacts. For these reasons we rated the DEIS as "Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information" (EC-2). In regards to the FEIS, EPA continues to have concerns for environmental justice impacts, greenhouse gases, and indirect effects. We have enclosed detailed comments which clarify our concerns.

EPA appreciates the opportunity to review the FEIS. Please send our office one copy of the record of decision (ROD) to my attention. If you have any questions or concerns, I can be reached at 214-665-7505, or contact Keith Hayden of my staff at hayden.keith@epa.gov or 214-665-2133.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Craig Weeks", is written over a horizontal line.

Craig Weeks
Chief, Office of Planning
and Coordination

Enclosure

**DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE CORPUS CHRISTI LNG PROJECT**

BACKGROUND: The proposed action would provide facilities necessary to import, export, store, vaporize, and liquefy natural gas and deliver the resulting product either into existing interstate and intrastate natural gas pipelines in the Corpus Christi area, or export LNG elsewhere. Terminal, pipeline, and other facilities would be constructed to accomplish the proposed action.

Cheniere would construct the LNG import and export terminal on a 991-acre site located along the northern shore of Corpus Christi Bay at the north end of the La Quinta Channel in San Patricio and Nueces Counties, Texas. Cheniere would also construct approximately 23 miles of 48-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline, two compressor stations, and six meter and regulator stations.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Page 4-83

The FEIS includes demographic information at the Census Tract level for the proposed project and states that it is the smallest geographic unit available. Census information is available at the block group level for minority percentage and can provide a finer level of analysis regarding the potential impacts of the project on minority communities. FERC states that “communities in the immediate vicinity of the Project area do not show any fundamental characteristics that would differentiate them from Nueces or San Patricio counties...” In our draft comments, EPA identified several blockgroups that had high minority or low income percentages. In our draft comments EPA requested a map showing the project footprint in relation to these blockgroups which would assist in supporting FERCs assertion that there are no EJ concerns in the project area. No map was provided in the FEIS. Please provide a map in the ROD.

Page 4-85

FERC states that only “a small portion of tract 110 would be crossed by the pipeline, but impacts would not be anticipated to be disproportionate because impacts of pipeline construction are considered temporary.” Even though construction is considered temporary, it does not follow that there would be no impacts to identified minority or low income communities. Further, FERC does not address operation and maintenance impacts of the pipeline or emergency response situations that have the potential to disproportionately impact minority residents in Tract 110. Tract 110 was previously identified as having a higher minority percentage compared to surrounding counties. In the ROD, please discuss any impacts, temporary or otherwise, that operation and maintenance of the pipeline would have on tract 110. Include information

regarding how pipeline emergencies could potentially affect the surrounding communities and how the surrounding communities will be notified in the event of an emergency scenario.

INDIRECT EFFECTS

EPA notes that the FEIS did not include consideration of the potential impacts resulting from increased production of natural gas attributable to LNG export facilities due to the challenge of attributing development of natural gas resources to one export project. While we recognize this challenge, both the Department of Energy (DOE) and FERC have recognized that an expansion of LNG exports would lead to increases in production. We continue to believe that a conceptual-level discussion of possible impacts from increased production due to proposed facilities would be useful for decision makers and the public. We continue to recommend discussing these potential impacts at a conceptual level by incorporating the results of the DOE study referenced in our August 4th letter in the ROD and in future NEPA documents for LNG facilities¹.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS (GHG)

We also continue to recommend disclosing the greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) associated with the production, transport, and combustion of the natural gas proposed to be exported by the project as part of the NEPA analysis. As our comments on the Draft EIS noted, the Department of Energy's recent report regarding GHGs associated with LNG export terminals² provides a helpful overview of GHG emissions from all stages of a project, from production through transmission and combustion, and also includes comparative analysis of GHG emissions associated with other domestic fuel sources and LNG exports as they relate to other possible fuel sources in receiving regions. This DOE analysis provides a basis for FERC to review the potential incremental GHG emissions associated with the project, and provide decision makers with helpful information that can inform their decision, as NEPA is designed to do.

More specifically with regard to the combustion of the natural gas, we disagree with your assertion in the Final EIS that "the impacts of end use in foreign, likely non-adjacent, countries is beyond the scope of a project proposed within the United States and evaluated under NEPA and CEQ regulations." Because of the global nature of climate change, even where the ultimate end use of the natural gas occurs outside the US, additional greenhouse gas emissions attributable to the project would affect the US. Consistent with NEPA and CEQ regulations, because any such emissions will contribute to climate change impacts in the US, it is appropriate to consider and disclose them in the EIS due to their reasonably close causal relationship to the project.

¹ Addendum to Environmental Review Documents Concerning Exports of Natural Gas from the United States. DOE. (<http://energy.gov/fe/downloads/addendum-environmental-review-documents-concerning-exports-natural-gas-us>)

² Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States. DOE/NETL-2014/1649 (<http://energy.gov/fe/life-cycle-greenhouse-gas-perspective-exporting-liquefied-natural-gas-united-states>)